

3379
C 16n

Return this book on or before the
Latest Date stamped below

OAK ST. HDSF

University of Illinois Library

SEP 27 1967

MAR 17 1967

1.161-1141

Mar 30.

Reciprocity with Canada.

If the Republican Party is to Live, It Can Live Only by Being True to and Supporting the Policy of Protection.

SPEECH OF HON. JOSEPH G. CANNON, OF ILLINOIS, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, April 19, 1911.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes—

Mr. CANNON said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Not, in my judgment, since the War with Spain and all that followed it, of benefit and of burden, has there been considered by the House of Representatives so important a bill as the one now pending. Therefore, it is entitled, without passion and without prejudice, to the careful, candid consideration of this great body, 391 in number, representing 92,000,000 of people, for on its consideration and enactment or defeat, in my judgment, rests the well-being and the prosperity of all of the people of the United States.

I represent a district agricultural in part—I think perhaps one of the best in the United States—and in part a manufacturing district. When I state that in my district there are many thousands of men in organized union labor, in mine and in factory, you will at once understand that I represent people who produce not only in the factory, but in the mine and on the farm. The output of coal from two townships in my own county is over 3,000,000 tons annually, and the output and development are rapidly increasing.

But, aside from the interests of my own district, I want to stand here and say that I am equally anxious to promote the welfare of every American citizen, whether in Greater New York, the mightiest of all our cities, in Chicago, the second city in the United States, or in Philadelphia, the third. I want to do what is best for all the people, North and South, East and West, as we stretch from 49° on the north down to the Gulf, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific. When I vote on this bill I vote for legislation that goes to every fireside, and I would not receive my own approval or retain my own self-respect if I stood attempting to array section against section, industry against industry, farmer against factory man, capitalist, or railroad man.

So I approach the discussion of this important bill from the standpoint of the best interests of all. That much by way of introduction.

It is proposed, on slight consideration, to vitalize into law an agreement that will throw, without let or hindrance, into the United States the market furnished by 92,000,000 of people the agricultural products of 8,000,000 people in Canada. Now, if this is to our advantage, in Heaven's name let us do it. If it be to our disadvantage, as we shall answer to our own self-respect and judgment, and later on to our constituents, let us not do it. And in cold blood I am going to inquire, as briefly as possible, whether it ought to be done or not.

REVENUE BILLS SHOULD NOT ORIGINATE WITH THE EXECUTIVE.

Mind you, so far as the country is concerned, so far as the Senate is concerned, so far as the House of Representatives is concerned, this bill, except by virtue of two amendments added to it, was not prepared in accordance with the Constitution. Our fathers wisely provided that revenue measures should have their origin in the House and that the Senate might amend. They wisely provided that while the President may recommend legislation he only becomes a coordinate branch of the legislative body when the House and Senate have agreed on bills, which, if they are revenue bills, must originate in the House. Then he only has power to approve on the one hand or disapprove on the other, which disapproval is efficient, unless two-thirds of the House and Senate pass the bill notwithstanding that disapproval.

Here is a measure that was made in secret. Is there anybody within the sound of my voice on either side of this House, whether he is for or against this bill, far-reaching as it is, affecting every hearthstone, if vitalized, who will say that he knew anything about this agreement until we received the President's message, with the accompanying bill, which was formally introduced in the House at the last session by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCall]? I pause for an answer. No man arises in his place in this great body and says he was consulted.

When we come to deal with foreign countries, the Constitution provides that a treaty made by the Executive, and vitalized by the approval of the Senate by a two-thirds majority, shall be the supreme law. What did our fathers mean when they provided in this manner for the making of treaties which should be the supreme law of the land? They knew that the world was large, with conflicting interests, diverse civilizations, governments differing in their organization. So the great power of negotiating treaties was placed in the hands of the President, but to become effective they must be vitalized by the concurrence of the Senate, not by a majority, not in a minute, not under the previous question, but after serious consideration in executive session and by a two-thirds vote. Looking in your eyes, Mr. Chairman, I say there have been treaties made even under the safeguards of the Constitution, after full consideration, that have not been wise.

Take the War with Spain. Ex-Speaker Reed once said, "When you go to war no man knows the end thereof." We went into that war because gentlemen on the other side, being in the minority, moved by a spirit of altruism, crossed on a

little bit of politics, grew very patriotic, and we on this side also grew very patriotic. War was declared. The end thereof was the Philippines, responsibility for Cuba and for Porto Rico. To indicate that mistakes perchance may sometimes be made in the making of treaties, even with the two-thirds majority required in the Senate for ratification, we have the Philippines, in my judgment, for all time. We say on the stump, "Oh, we are going to civilize them and make them competent for self-government, and then we are going to tell them, 'Go forth and govern yourselves.'"

The treaty was concluded. Now, I am not speaking of the peerless leader, Mr. Bryan, to criticize; but it was necessary for him with his great personality to come to Washington and exercise his great influence to bring about the ratification of that treaty. He has been down here again performing the same function. [Applause on the Republican side.]

He put his strong hand and eloquent tongue upon his party friends in the Senate and the necessary majority was furnished to ratify that treaty. When a thing is accomplished I never grumble. I would not refer to it now did I not aim merely to illustrate how important it is in a government by the people under the Constitution to observe the law not only in the letter but in the spirit.

You may say that a government of the people is so wise and good and patriotic that no advantage can be taken of it. Nevertheless, when you deal with the nations of the world, when you deal, through the mother country, with our friends across the Canadian border, you want to be mindful of a favorite expression of an old constituent of mine who dropped now and then into a little bit of poetry. He was my client. He said: "This is an exceedingly important matter." I replied, "The plaintiff is not a bad man." "Oh," said he, "Mr. CANNON, you don't know him; he may not be bad, but when it comes to material matters he steeps his tongue in honey and clothes his feet in the cunning of a fox." [Laughter.] That is true not only of individuals and parties, but it is especially true of great countries.

NO AUTHORITY TO MAKE TRADE AGREEMENTS.

This bill is to carry out what is called a reciprocal trade agreement. Has the President any authority in law by which he can make such agreements? I will let Mr. PAYNE, former chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, answer that question. When Mr. PAYNE presented to the House the bill which bears his name and made his speech explaining and defending it, he was asked by Mr. COX of Indiana:

Is there anything in this bill which would enable the President of the United States to negotiate any trade agreement with Germany?

Mr. PAYNE. There is not.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Is there any other law in effect that would still authorize him to do that?

Mr. PAYNE. No law, except the general provisions of the Constitution allowing him to negotiate treaties and submit them to the Senate.

Now, what are the objections to this bill; first, from the standpoint of the farmer, who comprises one-third of our population; and, second, from the standpoint of the other two-thirds? What is for the best interest of all the people? In considering this matter I crave the attention of the House, and I will try not to be tedious.

90983—9855

Our 92,000,000 people have just scratched the resources of the United States. The countries of Europe, including Great Britain, have a population of from 300,000,000 to 350,000,000 people. With a country far better than Europe in quality of soil, in mineral wealth, and in resources of every kind, we can, when fully developed, easily support with bread and meat and clothing and everything, save the products of the Tropics, 400,000,000 or 500,000,000 people.

How rapidly we have grown and developed. I am not an old man, but I recollect very well when there were but 17,000,000 people in the United States. I have observed a great many things since that time. I recollect very well when there were not 100 miles of railway in all the country west of the Allegheny Mountains. I recollect very well when the only market was found in New Orleans for all the great Mississippi Valley, and I might say almost for the whole Middle West was found in New Orleans. The flatboats floated down the Mississippi carrying our products, and the little steamer came back laden with the products received in exchange.

—I know what it is to have seen Ohio, Indiana, Missouri to a great extent, and Michigan and Iowa and all that country of the great West brought partially under subjection. On the Wabash, where you could cut the malaria with a knife [laughter], where the timber was thick and heavy, there was no place to plant corn or sow wheat. They did not believe that men could live on the rich prairies of the West. It was supposed that they never would be settled. It was worth a man's life to cut down the forest and bring 80 acres under subjection in that timbered section, and then when he built a new house, costing from \$700 to \$800 in labor, he died. Of course he did, he was worn out.

There was the same struggle in Ohio, in Pennsylvania, and in New York; and let me say to my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] that it was a long time after the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers before they extended settlement and development very greatly in New England. I am old enough to recollect the time when those splendid lands in Illinois and Iowa, which could be obtained on military land warrants at 70 cents an acre, were supposed to be good for nothing except grazing. No one ever dreamed that the time would come when the lands in the Genesee Valley in New York would depreciate in value by one-half or more. At that time the tide of immigration from the East to the West had not set in to any great extent. The railroads came, and when I speak of the railroads—and I do it with pride—I think of that great Democratic statesman, Stephen A. Douglas. The quickening hand of development never struck the State of Illinois until 1850, when, under the leadership of Mr. Douglas, then a Senator of national reputation, there was enacted a law granting land to the State of Illinois, the alternate sections being reserved. Under and by virtue of that act the Illinois Central Railroad was constructed from Chicago to Cairo and from Centralia to Dunleith. The alternate sections were snapped up in the twinkling of an eye at \$2.50 an acre. Immigration set in. There was a chance to get to market. You all know the history of development since that time.

The war came—that great struggle that we all thank God resulted as it did. Then, from political and military necessity

during the war it became necessary to begin the construction of a railroad to the Pacific coast. Deserts and mountains and Indians had to be overcome. The line ran through an uninhabited country, but that railroad was built in the fullness of time. Then came the Northern Pacific, and then the Southern Pacific, the Santa Fe, and the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul. Then came James J. Hill, that wizard among business men, a great man who leads in doing great things, and with him came the building of the Great Northern from Duluth, reaching across the continent to Seattle and the Pacific. As a result the western country was settled pretty rapidly.

CAUSE OF ABANDONED FARMS IN THE EAST.

But what was happening in the meantime down in New York and New England? While the rich prairie lands in Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Missouri, and Illinois were being developed—virgin soil, such as it seems to me God never made anywhere else on earth—what was happening in the East? Many of the bright, enterprising boys took Horace Greeley's advice and went west. They went in great droves and helped to develop that country. Railroads were built and transportation charges were brought down until you could place a barrel of flour made from wheat grown in Minnesota or Illinois or Missouri, manufactured in Minneapolis or St. Louis, into the market of a little hamlet anywhere in New England for less money than you could haul it in a wagon 3 miles. [Applause.] The result was that the lands in the Genesee Valley in northern New York and in New England could not compete with the production of those lands in the West, where you had only to tickle the earth to have it fructify and bring forth in marvelous abundance fruits and cereals.

The farmers in many sections of the East were placed at such disadvantage that many farms were abandoned in Connecticut, in Massachusetts, in all New England, in New York, and, to some extent, in Pennsylvania. There were more than 7,000,000 acres in abandoned farms in New England and New York. There was also a reduction of \$260,000,000 in the value of farm lands and buildings in the same States in those 20 years. In the period from 1880 to the year 1900, even in magnificent Ohio, which has not yet lost the capacity to breed and produce Presidents, the farmers suffered a decrease of \$100,000,000 in the value of their farm lands in the presence of this competition from the West.

In developing the West we have sometimes suffered even from the excess of rich soil. I recall that upon the prairie in Illinois, within 50 miles of where I now live, with good railroad connections, with coal without limit deposited by the Almighty in the immediate neighborhood, I have seen corn, as good and sound as was ever grown, burned for fuel to keep the frost out. I merely speak of that to illustrate that our production was so great that the East, notwithstanding her decadence in agriculture, could not take our surplus. We had a long, weary road to travel, but men with brave hearts said "We want better markets; we will build more railroads"; and they got the railroads built.

It is needless to recount the growth and development of the middle and western sections of the country since 1860, when Abraham Lincoln was nominated as a candidate for the Presi-

dency. Nor is it necessary to refer to the splendid cities that have sprung up—Chicago, the great market place for all the Middle West, which has grown from less than 100,000 people in 1860 to two and one-half millions of people, and countless other prosperous communities. It is, however, significant to note in connection with the consideration of this bill the remarkable, if not ominous, trend from the farm to the city, a movement which, in my opinion, will be stimulated by the enactment of this bill. To-day there is a far less percentage of people engaged in agriculture in the United States than there was in 1860. At that time more than one-half of our people were engaged in agricultural pursuits, while to-day the percentage is not over one-third. It is true that, aided by invention, with improved farm machinery, with the steam plow, the reaper, and the binder, one man on the farm now can do more than two or three men on the farm in the old days. But let us be honest; the same is true in all the walks of life. One man in a machine shop now can accomplish more than four men could have accomplished in 1860, until to-day the 92,000,000 people in the United States are producing more agricultural and more manufactured products—I measure my words in making the statement—than all Europe. That is a pretty strong statement, but it is true.

FREE LABOR V. SLAVE LABOR.

We fought out the economic question from 1861 to 1865. The Government's need for money, the necessity in the Northland to produce munitions of war, gave birth to the protective policy, and under it we prospered; while down South, with as good brain and brawn and as splendid manhood and womanhood as was to be found in the North they found difficulty in procuring proper arms and munitions and sufficient subsistence.

In that contest the great question touching labor was settled, and settled forever, in our country. The result was good for the North; it was good for the South; but it never would have been settled had it not been that roaming around in the body and brain of the average man, the mechanic and farmer, was a feeling that when a slave was doing in the South the work that elsewhere in the country was being done by an American sovereign, responsible for the control of the country, the dignity of labor was degraded.

With the close of that great struggle came an increased necessity for revenues to pay the Nation's debts, to pay pensions, to assist in the building of railways, to improve the great rivers and harbors, and the revenues were derived principally under the policy of protection. We said that the foreigner paid most of the tax; you said it was paid by the individual who consumed. Well, I can not stop your saying that, and you can not stop my saying the other; but, lo and behold, what have we achieved? Under this policy of protection we have prospered, until we now have over one-fourth of all the wealth of all the world, and it is better distributed amongst our 92,000,000 of people than is the wealth of any other nation in the world. Now, it may be that you Democrats could have done a great deal better, and if I were to make that charge you would confess it [laughter]; but there is no way of turning the hands back on the dial, and I suppose you will just have to

accept the results, because if you had continued that policy of servile labor for which you fought, the South, instead of having a renaissance, instead of having improvement of land and all values, instead of having increased production by three, would now, in my judgment, be practically deserted.

But what has that got to do with Canada? I will ask to have the map brought in. I always believe in kindergarten instruction. [Laughter and applause.] I learned more readily in that way than in any other.

The time came when we found it was necessary to improve our agriculture; and I thank God for the instruction that is being given in our colleges, in our agricultural papers, and by our experts. I thank God that all over the country we are not wasting the natural resources of the soil as we did when corn was burned for fuel. We are improving all along the line now, and in no section is the improvement more noticeable than in the South.

I was born in North Carolina, and when 4 years old, in the arms of my mother, was moved over the mountains. The family went to the Wabash, and my good old mother never ceased mourning for the magnificent climate of North Carolina. My father, when a young man, helped to found a college down near Greensboro, N. C. A few years ago I accepted an invitation to attend its commencement. I arrived the day before the commencement, and I went around with Prof. Hobbs through the section of country in the vicinity of Greensboro.

PROSPERITY RETURNS TO THE SOUTH.

I visited the old farm where I was born, and found there every evidence of prosperity and thrift. As I remembered the place, it was crossed by deep gullies and was not good for very much. I asked the farmer how he got the land into such a prosperous state. He replied that he began by throwing a dam across each gully, so that the dirt washed in and leveled up the land. Then he had found the use of clover and cowpeas and improved the land, and that while he had paid only \$10 an acre for it a few years before, he had within a few days refused \$25 per acre. I asked if any other agency were at work in bringing about this increase than his own labor and intelligence. "Oh, yes," said he, "we have railroads and factories now. Over here at Greensboro they have large factories, and I find there a market for my chickens and eggs and all the small fruit I have to sell."

I was amazed at the evidences of progress on every side, and if I had been taken into Greensboro blindfolded I would have remarked, "How marvelously has the city of Peoria, or the city of Quincy, improved."

So that renaissance in agriculture is not only going on in New York and in New England, but is going on in the South. The quickening life of other industries furnishes a market.

I went out to the old Quaker graveyard and even there I could trace the progress of that country. The first little monuments were 2 or 3 feet high, but gradually higher ones were added, until the monuments of the last 8 or 10 years compare favorably with those erected in any prosperous community. The graveyard told the story.

I am interested in seeing North Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, all the Southern States, diversify their industries and restore their lands.

With our enterprising people, the most enterprising in the history of the human race, the Mississippi Valley bottom lands will discount a dozen Niles in Egypt in production. I am anxious to see them reclaimed, and by the aid and cooperation of our 92,000,000 of people, as the Federal Government performs its function, the rivers tributary to the Mississippi will be made good outlets for the tile, and when that land is drained it is the best land on earth.

I want to ask—and I would like to have an answer from any gentleman on the other side from the Southland—Is it not true that in the last 10 years, certainly in the last 20 years, the value of your lands, improved and unimproved, has doubled and been multiplied by three? “Oh, well,” you say, “we raise cotton down there, and we have a monopoly of that production.” But do you know that last year, with a bumper crop of corn, aggregating three thousand million bushels in the United States, you raised in the Southland, in addition to your valuable cotton crop, one-third of that great corn crop—a thousand millions of bushels?

You may say, “The wheat farmers over in Canada with their cheap lands do not bother us.” I will show you in a moment. Counting Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, the Southland produced almost one-third of the magnificent wheat crop of 1910. I will insert the actual figures later. If you did not raise a bushel of corn or a bushel of wheat or a bushel of oats or a bushel of barley or a bushel of potatoes, Irish or sweet, you would be interested. If you did not raise anything but cotton you would be interested, just as much as we of the Northland who do not raise cotton and who are liberal customers of yours, as you would be liberal customers of ours under the same circumstances. The South is growing more and more able to live within itself, and as she grows more and more able to do that her income will be greater and greater, and your fellow citizens all over the country will get their share as you get yours of the general prosperity.

Just here I want to call the attention of the honorable Speaker of the House to the interest the farmers of Missouri have in this bill. Missouri is a banner agricultural State. Her production of hay, oats, corn, barley, and fruits is enormous. In 10 years the value of Missouri farm lands has been more than doubled, and in 1910 that State produced more than 25,000,000 bushels of wheat.

I desire to inquire of my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], who made a speech yesterday, what he will say to the people of Oklahoma, in whose growth and progress we all take pride, and which also produced in 1910 more than 25,000,000 bushels of wheat, when they complain that you have brought in competition with their products the almost illimitable production of Canada?

OUR OWN CITIZENS MUST DEFEND THE FLAG.

Recollect, if there is war, every citizen of the United States is called upon to defend the Republic. If there are school houses to build, if there are colleges to found, if there are

railroads to maintain, if there are factories to construct, if labor is to be furnished, we can rely only on our own people. In the event of trouble, how much in taxes would Canada contribute for the preservation of the Republic? In the event of war, how many soldiers from Canada would fight the battles of the great Republic? How many of Canada's people would contribute to education in the United States? The college professors flourish and expound their delightful theories: "All mankind are brothers; all men are equal." Very good generalities, but all men are not equal from the intellectual standpoint. Some men are born simple-minded, some go to the insane asylum, some are weak, some are strong, some are wise, and some are wiser.

Mr. MURDOCK. And otherwise. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Yes; and otherwise. I am reminded that I have spoken an hour. I must hurry along, because there are several other matters I want to talk about.

Gentlemen, there come times in the history of a generation when those who have had the kindergarten instruction are in the minority. To the young who come in you may theorize and preach, but they know better, and 5 per cent of them—a percentage that holding the balance of power work a political revolution, five off one side and five on the other—have to learn through their stomachs what they do not learn through their heads. [Laughter.] This is true sometimes, not only of men in the shops, on the farm, and on the railways, but of men in office, and I have known it to be true of Members of Congress. [Laughter.] It is not a theory, whether it is your doxy or my doxy, that I care about, but facts. What will this bill do to us or for us?

It is 3,700 miles across Canada from ocean to ocean. Eight millions of people occupy that land, while we have 92,000,000. The countries were settled about the same time. The people of Canada are good people. We have had lots of them come to this country, and they have made good citizens. They came because it was for their interest to come. Now they have waked up. Great Britain is a wise country, a far-reaching country. The sun never sets on her possessions. Far away India, the Straits Settlements, Africa, Asia, Europe, North America—all in greater or less degree are under the magic wand of that great people. They are our brothers, our uncles, our fathers, and grandfathers, and if anybody thinks the people of Canada are fools they are mistaken. What have they in railway development?

Here (indicating on a map) is the Hudson Bay; here is the 49th parallel of latitude, the boundary between Canada and the United States. Canada has to-day, with 8,000,000 people, 24,000 miles of railway. We have 92,000,000 people, with a territory comparatively well settled, and we have 240,000 miles of railway. It is said our lands have been taken up, but there are large areas of public land in western Kansas, Nebraska, the Dakotas, Washington, and all over that great western country which, with improved agriculture and with better farming, all things considered, would make the best lands in the world.

It is said there is no danger from a free market with Canada

so far as our wheat is concerned. Let us see about that. The President in his message says practically that this bill will eventually reduce the cost of living and will not reduce the price of the farmer's products in the United States. Our President is a great man and I have great respect for him. I voted for him, and I apprehend that I will vote for him again. I am not here to abuse him, but I would like to see him demonstrate the proposition that it will not impair the farmer's prices and yet will still reduce the cost of living. [Laughter and applause.]

CANADIAN RAILWAY DEVELOPMENT BY SUBSIDIES.

The Canadian Pacific Railroad stretches across the country to Vancouver, with substantially 10,000 miles in Canada and 4,000 miles in the United States. The 24,000 miles of railway built in Canada have received over \$300,000,000 in aid from that Government and 55,000,000 acres of the best cereal producing land, excluding corn, on earth. The stock of the Canadian Pacific, as I recall, amounts to \$1,300,000,000. My friend from New York says that is too high, that that is the amount of the stock of all the Canadian railroads. However, its stock yesterday, I believe—a 10 per cent stock, was quoted at 224 or 225. The stock of the Union Pacific Railroad, one of the best equipped railroads on earth, is a 10 per cent stock and has never defaulted, but it is quoted at about 170.

The Canadian Pacific has also great steamship lines aided by the Canadian Government to the extent of a million and a half dollars bounty annually, and those steamship lines reach Japan, Hongkong, Australia, and San Francisco, and run down the South American coast and across the ocean to Liverpool.

Then comes the Grand Trunk, running from Quebec and Montreal to Winnipeg, branching out with three or four lines and running up here [indicating on map] from Manitoba, through the two great Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. I understand it is also extending its line by Government aid to the Pacific coast, and that the extensions are soon to be completed. Already there is another great transcontinental system, the Canada Northern, being constructed by Government aid. It is connecting up the smaller roads that have been constructed, touches Winnipeg, and will have a terminus on the Pacific coast at a point not yet determined upon, but in the vicinity of Prince Rupert. Already it has, if I remember aright, over 2,500 miles constructed, and I read in the New York Sun that it has contracted for the construction, I believe, of four or five hundred miles this year. So that all things considered, the railroad development in Canada is simply wonderful. What good are the railroads going to do? Why do they build them? To aid in the settlement and development of a vast territory capable of producing vast quantities of grain.

I speak of the President respectfully, because I entertain the highest respect for him, but if he makes a mistake touching a policy or recommendation it does not absolve me. I have a warrant from the people—not as many as he has a warrant from, but from the people that I represent in my vote here, and when I vote my vote affects also the people of New Jersey and Florida and all the country, and I must follow my own

judgment. I have done so in the past, and, God helping me, I will in the future after investigation follow my judgment, whatever Presidents may recommend. [Applause.] His duty is to veto or approve my action when it reaches him, not to dictate it. [Renewed applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am a Member of this body, and proud of it. I believe in it. It has its duty under the Constitution, and God helping me, whoever is President, and however the Senate is composed, while I hold official position I will walk in the shadow of my own judgment as God gives me to see the light, although I tread the path alone. [Applause.]

The President in his message congratulates the country on the making of the so-called reciprocity agreement, and says in effect that we have been aided greatly in developing the United States by immigration from Canada. He says further—I do not quote him literally—that it is well for our patriotic, wise, and experienced farmers to go over into the promised land and help in the development of Canada. Now, let us see about that. In the last two years, if I recollect right, about 300,000 American farmers went over into Canada. But it is said, "That is a new country; don't you know, Mr. CANNON, that the people in the United States are to be greatly benefited by getting free wheat from that country," and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] says that the improved farms in Canada are worth as much as they are in New York, if I remember correctly.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman did not understand.

Mr. CANNON. Then, I will stand corrected.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman misunderstands a great many things.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well, one thing at a time. I am not clothed with all wisdom; I do not have all kinds of statistical knowledge crowded into my head at all kinds of angles, and the power to defend the industries of Connecticut at one session of Congress and attack the industries of the balance of the country at another. [Cheers and applause.]

WHEAT LANDS IN CANADIAN NORTHWEST.

Now, how much wheat did Canada produce in the year 1909? In round numbers, if I recollect right, 166,000,000 bushels. Where was it grown? All except about 19,000,000 bushels grown in eastern Canada was produced in Manitoba, in far-away Saskatchewan, in far-away Alberta, with a very little bit in British Columbia. That shows what that new country can do. How much of the land there is under cultivation? Under cultivation in these three Provinces last year there were less than 12,000,000 acres. What says the deputy minister of agriculture of the Province of Alberta? George Harcourt, deputy minister of agriculture for the Province of Alberta, in 1909, made this report:

Of the country which is known the area capable of producing grain is 220,000,000 acres. The total area in crops last year was 11,257,870 acres, producing a total crop of 240,000,000 bushels. The unoccupied land in the future will produce at least 5,000,000,000 bushels. This is not the end. There is a great northern country, the McKenzie Basin, which is capable of producing grain. (Canadian Yearbook.)

I cite the following as to wheat production in the United States and Canada, and the figures are taken from official Government reports:

Wheat statistics.

	Bushels.
Wheat produced in United States, 1910	691, 767, 000
Wheat exported bushels 24, 257, 392} 59, 923, 521	

Flour exported 8,370,251 barrels=bushels 35, 666, 129}	59, 923, 521
--	--------------

Wheat consumed in United States	631, 843, 479
---------------------------------	---------------

Wheat produced in Canada, 1909	166, 744, 000
Wheat exported bushels 49, 000, 000} 53, 500, 000	

Flour exported 1,000,000 barrels=bushels 4, 500, 000}	53, 500, 000
---	--------------

Wheat consumed in Canada	113, 244, 000
--------------------------	---------------

Wheat produced in Canada, 1909	166, 744, 000
--------------------------------	---------------

Wheat produced in Manitoba bushels 52, 706, 000	166, 744, 000
Wheat produced in Saskatchewan do 85, 197, 000	

Wheat produced in Alberta do 9, 579, 000	147, 482, 000
--	---------------

Wheat produced in remainder of Canada	19, 262, 000
---------------------------------------	--------------

The three Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta produced this yield of wheat with less than 12,000,000 acres under cultivation. They have an available area suited to the cultivation of wheat of 220,000,000 acres.

	Bushels.
Average yield of wheat per acre, Canada, 1909	21 $\frac{1}{2}$
Average yield of wheat per acre, United States, 1909	15 $\frac{1}{2}$

Wheat statistics, 1910.

[Crop Reporter, Department of Agriculture, 1910.]

	Bushels.
Minnesota	94, 080, 000
North Dakota	36, 105, 000
South Dakota	46, 720, 000
Washington	25, 603, 000
Oregon	16, 413, 000
Idaho	12, 603, 000
Montana	10, 470, 000

Total	241, 994, 000
-------	---------------

Wheat produced in Southern States (including Kansas and Oklahoma).

	Bushels.
Maryland	13, 816, 000
Virginia	10, 176, 000
West Virginia	5, 125, 000
North Carolina	7, 433, 000
South Carolina	4, 983, 000
Georgia	2, 730, 000
Missouri	25, 130, 000
Kentucky	9, 600, 000
Kansas	62, 068, 000
Tennessee	10, 647, 000
Alabama	1, 560, 000
Mississippi	78, 000
Texas	18, 780, 000
Oklahoma	25, 363, 000
Arkansas	2, 710, 000
New Mexico	860, 000
Arizona	379, 000

Total	201, 438, 000
-------	---------------

AMERICAN FARMERS GO TO CANADA.

But some one says, "Mr. CANNON, our improved lands are substantially the same price as Canadian improved land." Granted. The price of improved lands in the farming districts of New York

is substantially the same, as I understand, as those in Ontario, and perhaps the price of land in Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire is substantially the same as the price of land in Quebec and perhaps in Nova Scotia. I am only approximating; but let us see. When you lose an industrious farmer who understands the science of farming, with his wife and his children, you lose more than money. [Applause on the Republican side.] A few days ago Mr. Earling, manager of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad and brother of its president, did me the honor to call on me to pay his respects. I was glad to see him. I asked, "Are you carrying lots of home seekers on that great road of yours?" He replied, "A good many." I inquired, "Where are they going—to the Dakotas and on to Montana and Washington?" "No," he replied, "we are carrying more than we ever carried, but we are only carrying them as far as Minneapolis." I asked him why they stopped at Minneapolis, and he answered, "They tranship for Manitoba and Saskatchewan and Alberta." One-half, two-thirds—yes; more than that—of the 200,000,000 acres of land in the Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta—and a great portion of them are as good as the sun ever shone upon—may be homesteaded, and if a man lives on the homestead for a year and turns over the sod on 30 acres, he takes title in fee. Then he can buy an adjacent quarter section, if it has not yet been taken up, at the Government price. In addition, there is much of the 55,000,000 acres of land granted by the Government to the railways which is subject to settlement on favorable terms. And yet Liverpool fixes the price of our grain say my friends who agree with the President, and all this will not make any difference in the price!

Now let us inquire about that. The freight rate on wheat from Winnipeg to Liverpool is less than it is from Minneapolis to Liverpool. I have made inquiry about this, and I speak by the book. Will some gentleman be kind enough to explain to me in his own time why it is, under such circumstances, that the price of wheat, equal in quality, as shown by the report of the Tariff Board called for by a resolution of the Senate, averages from 10 to 12 cents more per bushel the year round in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg? Last year the magnificent crop of wheat in the United States, amounting to nearly 700,000,000 bushels, was all consumed in the United States except about 60,000,000 bushels.

What was the per capita consumption of wheat in the United States last year? Nearly 7 bushels. What a contrast that is to the condition in 1894. In that year, in spite of a good crop of wheat in the United States, conditions were bad. I am not stating why they were bad; I am not seeking to play politics by referring to what happened while the Democratic Party had full possession of the Government; but I call attention to it in order to illustrate the point. In the four years from 1893 to 1897 there was a minimum of consumption of wheat—not more than about 4 bushels to each inhabitant. If I recollect aright, for one year, 1894, it was less than $3\frac{1}{2}$ bushels. In that year of lowest per capita consumption the price of wheat was the lowest we have had in 50 years—less than 50 cents a bushel to the farmer. What was the reason? Who buys the wheat after the farmer consumes his share? The other two-thirds of the

people in the United States. A falling off in the consumption of wheat at the rate of 1 bushel to each inhabitant in the United States represents a loss of 92,000,000 bushels. Last year we had a great crop, and more than six-sevenths of it was consumed here. Less than 70,000,000 bushels of it went abroad.

Between 6 and 7 bushels per capita was retained in this country for consumption. Why? Because our people—the men on the railroads, the men in the factories, and in other branches—were fairly well employed. They received increased wages. There was a great cry raised by politicians, by the college professors, and others as to the high cost of living; and yet two-thirds of the people, I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey, earned sufficient wages to consume $6\frac{1}{2}$ bushels of wheat to each man, woman, and child, and they had the wherewith to pay for it. In the four years from 1893 to 1897 the average consumption was a little less than 4 bushels per capita. Why? Hundreds of thousands of men were tramping; three or four millions of men were out of employment, or on short employment.

FARM PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS DECLINE.

Let us pursue that policy whereby we adjust our production so that it is consumed substantially in the United States. Let us do as other nations do, and pursue that policy which is for our best interest. When a man says to me that Liverpool fixes the price of grain for this crop of over 600,000,000 bushels of wheat, five-sixths of which is consumed in the United States, I say to him that I will believe him when he shows me that the tail wags the dog. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Since the election on the 8th day of November last, when our Democratic friends succeeded in carrying the House of Representatives by a majority of over 60, the farm price of agricultural products in the United States has decreased more than 25 per cent. The value of the product of labor and effort in other lines of industry, however, has not depreciated since that event. The wages of the employee in the factory, on the railroad, and in the mine have not been reduced, and I hope they will not be, although I could wish that there were a surer foundation for the hope than at present exists.

The cost of food products to the ultimate consumer, after they have passed through the hands of those who distribute, has not decreased in any commensurate proportion to the decrease in the farm price of agricultural products; in fact, prices at retail are almost as high, considering the season, as they were last November.

The farmer is not to blame for this condition. Although the farm value of his products has decreased over one-fourth, there have been no strikes on the part of the farmer. He is patient, patriotic, loyal, and is willing to bear his share of losses which come under the natural laws of trade. He is willing to submit to that law which should regulate all commerce in the United States, namely, the regulation of price by the supply and the demand.

I ask the question, What would have happened in the United States if the compensation of those who employ labor had been reduced one-fourth and if the wages of labor on railway, in factory, and in other industries had been cut in proportion? All over the country men now employed would be idle. There

would be strikes, disorder, and panic, involving bankers, merchants, and the whole body politic.

Notwithstanding all this, the Democratic Party, with their enormous majority in the House, will pass this miscalled reciprocity bill, which will result in prosperity for our Canadian neighbors and bankruptcy for those engaged in agriculture in the United States.

This result may not come in a day, a week, or a month, but if this bill is enacted into law so long as it remains upon the statute book the situation will grow more and more acute, and while the burden will rest primarily upon those engaged in agriculture, no man lives to himself alone. Whatever injuriously affects the one-third of our population engaged in agriculture must inevitably react on and injure the other two-thirds. When the ability of the one-third to purchase the products of the other two-thirds is impaired, there must necessarily be a halting and slackening of production in all lines of industry, and we will have widespread panic and bankruptcy.

Some one says the northern railroads want this bill. Yes; some of them do; in fact, many of them do. One of the greatest men, in my judgment, in the United States, Mr. James J. Hill, a great railroad and empire builder, for whom I have the highest respect, heartily advocates this bill. He has builded a great railroad system from the Lakes to the Pacific Ocean, running near our northern boundary. I would rather agree with James J. Hill, Democrat as he is, than to disagree with him; but in my opinion the man is worse than an infidel who cares not for his own household. [Applause on the Republican side.] Here [indicating] is his railroad running up near the Canadian line, and you can count, as I have counted—and I think I have counted correctly—20 branch lines or spurs reaching over into this "poor" country of Manitoba, of Saskatchewan, and of Alberta. How poor that country is! Why, the eloquent gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER], for whom I have great respect, in his speech made me wonder why there was so much fuss made about this proposed reciprocity agreement, for he seemed to prove, satisfactorily to himself at any rate, that this land would wear out in his lifetime or mine. Well, we have the reports in regard to it, and they show that it has a magnificent subsoil.

CLIMATIC CONDITIONS FAVORABLE TO WHEAT.

I went to the Weather Bureau to ascertain about the climate in these Provinces. I told them that I had read about the Japan current, that I had read about the long hours of sunshine during the crop season in northern Canada, and that I wanted to know about it. I asked them to make me a map, and after a week they sent me this one [indicating]. These red lines [indicating] are the heat lines. This one [indicating] starts away down here, not a great way from the central part of northern New York, and runs away up almost to $54^{\circ} 40'$. These lines indicate that they have as much heat in Canada during the crop season, and more, than in North Dakota. These other lines indicate precipitation. I think I have asked the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HANNA] more questions, perhaps, than anybody else in regard to this matter in my effort to learn about the section of the country in which he lives.

As I have said, the crop season is from April to August. I asked him, "How about the wheat lands up there?" "Why," said he, "they are all right." "Well," said I, "don't you get nipped with the frost?" He said, "Florida had her orange groves frozen a few years ago; you lost a wheat crop within your own recollection in Illinois and Iowa; you had the great corn crop in 1863 or 1864 absolutely killed before the middle of August. You have got to run those risks everywhere in the Temperate Zone, north or south."

Now, last year there was not enough moisture in North Dakota, and the crop was short about 5 bushels to the acre—the gentleman from North Dakota will correct me if my statement is inaccurate—but in Alberta, here, and in Saskatchewan, a little to the north, I think they raised in the neighborhood of 20 bushels to the acre. They had a little more moisture there. The dews were heavier. Farther north they had a little more sunshine. After the closest study I have been able to give the matter I have no hesitation in saying that in these three Provinces, without going into the McKenzie Basin, here [indicating], which reaches away up to the sixtieth degree of latitude and above, tempered by the current that comes from the Pacific Ocean and by the winds that down in the State of Washington are called the chinook winds, with the Rocky Mountains lower, with the Coast Range almost obliterated—I say to you there is as much moisture during the crop season throughout all this country here, up to Prince Rupert, including British Columbia, as there is in North Dakota; as much as there is in South Dakota and northern Michigan; and as much as at Port Arthur, in the magnificent Province of Ontario, which reaches down like a wedge between New York on one side and Michigan on the other.

The average temperature at Edmonton, 325 miles north of the border line between Canada and the United States, is the same as at Kalispel, Mont., and Port Arthur on Lake Superior.

Calgary, 150 miles north of the border line, has the same average mean temperature as Duluth, Minn., Alpena, Mich., Devils Lake, N. Dak., Cheyenne, Wyo., and Denver, Colo.

There is more rainfall in the crop season 100 miles north of Edmonton than in any part of the States of Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, or northern North Dakota, and Minnesota, and the same rainfall as in North and South Dakota.

Calgary has the same precipitation as the northwestern part of the United States.

WE SHOULD CARE FOR OUR OWN.

Now, it is up to us to say whether we will care for our own. Will we continue to develop our own country from east to west and from north to south, or will we, without one iota of compensation, throw open our markets to all the agricultural products of the rapidly developing country in Canada?

Nations care for their own. These 92,000,000 of people of ours not only have to be strong enough, but wise enough, to face the world and pursue that policy that is the best for them.

Now, I want to say to the gentlemen from New York and Massachusetts and New England that in the last 10 years hundreds of millions of dollars have been added to the value

of your farm lands—enough to make up for the loss sustained prior to 1900, while we were developing the great West.

New York and New England had 7,200,000 acres of agricultural lands abandoned between 1880 and 1900. There was a reduction of \$260,000,000 in the value of farm lands and buildings in the same States in the same period.

Ohio also lost \$91,000,000 in the value of farm lands and buildings in the same time.

Illinois increased the value of farm lands and buildings in the same time \$756,000,000.

The losses in the East have been recovered in the last 10 years.

New England increased the value of farm lands and buildings \$183,000,000 since 1900.

Connecticut had a loss of \$24,000,000 in such values from 1880 to 1900 and a gain of \$39,000,000 from 1900 to 1910.

Maine had a loss of \$6,500,000 in such values from 1880 to 1900 and a gain of \$61,000,000 in the last 10 years.

Vermont's loss for the 20 years prior to 1900 was \$26,000,000, and her gain since that year \$29,000,000.

New Hampshire lost \$5,500,000 from 1880 to 1900 and gained \$15,500,000 in the last 10 years.

Massachusetts lost \$19,000,000 in the value of farm lands and farm buildings between 1880 and 1890 and gained \$54,000,000 in the same values in the last 20 years, \$33,000,000 of that increase being credited to the last 10 years.

Rhode Island lost \$2,000,000 in similar values from 1880 to 1900, and gained \$4,000,000 from 1900 to 1910.

The losses in value on farm lands and farm buildings from 1880 to 1900 in New England alone amounted to \$83,000,000, and the gains in the same section in the last 10 years amounted to \$183,000,000.

New York's farm lands and farm buildings were worth \$168,000,000 less in 1900 than in 1880 and \$288,000,000 more in 1910 than in 1900.

The Empire State in the last 10 years recovered her losses of the preceding 20 years and added \$120,000,000 as a net gain over the values she had in 1880, when her farms began to decline.

The average value of farm lands per acre increased in the last 10 years as follows:

	Per cent.
Maine	75
Massachusetts	32
Vermont	30
Connecticut	43
Rhode Island	17
New Hampshire	40
New York	31
Pennsylvania	14
Illinois	106
Indiana	94
Iowa	120
Michigan	33
Minnesota	76
Missouri	104

So I say that the renaissance in agriculture has come to the East as well as the West, and by this legislation you propose to check that return of the American farmer to his old-time prosperity.

HARRISON AND BLAINE ON RECIPROCITY.

There has never been a time when Canada was not earnestly knocking at the doors of the United States for the admission, without tax or tariff, of her agricultural products. I do not care whether you call it reciprocity or free gift. Gentlemen will recall the treaty of 1854 and its subsequent repeal. I will not go back to that; that is behind us. In 1892 Canada, through the British minister, asked the administration of Benjamin Harrison, Blaine being Secretary of State, to receive delegates from Canada to cooperate with the British minister in making a reciprocity agreement. They came. Harrison tells it in a few words:

Here is what President Harrison said in his last message, December 6, 1892:

During the past year a suggestion was received through the British minister that the Canadian Government would like to confer as to the possibility of enlarging upon terms of mutual advantage the commercial exchanges of Canada and the United States, and a conference was held at Washington, with Mr. Blaine acting for this Government and the British minister at this capital and three members of the Dominion cabinet acting as commissioners on the part of Great Britain.

The conference developed the fact that the Canadian Government was only prepared to offer to the United States in exchange for the concessions asked the admission of natural products. The statement was frankly made that favored rates could not be given to the United States as against the mother country. This admission, which was foreseen, necessarily terminated the conference upon this question. The benefits of an exchange of natural products would be almost wholly with the people of Canada.

Now, what is a natural product? Oh, the air, the ocean, the mountains, the coal in the ground, the forest, the soil, the iron ore in the ground, the limestone for the flux, the clay for the brick. But when the coal becomes coke, when the clay becomes fire brick, are these products natural products? No; because the mining of the coal requires labor; the coking of the coal requires labor. The man who digs the fire clay puts into it his labor; the man who mines the iron ore contributes his labor. Wherever the hand of man makes matter assume a shape that is useful to the human family, when it leaves his hand it has ceased to be a natural product and has become a finished product. [Applause on the Republican side.] What temerity to call a product a natural product after it has been touched by the hand of labor! I believe this bill is greatly in the interest of Canada, without compensating benefit to the United States. In support of that view I want to quote from the report of the proceedings in the Canadian House of Commons. They have the English system in Canada, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier has been, I believe, prime minister for 16 years. He is a man of great ability and a candid man.

PREMIER LAURIER SAYS IT BENEFITS CANADA.

In addressing the Canadian House of Commons on March 7 on this proposed, miscalled reciprocity agreement, amongst other things Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

We—

Referring to Canada—

are, above all, an agricultural people. Our chief wealth is the growth of these products of the Temperate Zone. What are they? Fruits, cereals, and vegetables; and it is our boast—not an idle boast, but a boast founded on actual experience—that in cereals, vegetables, and fruit we can, without exaggeration, beat the world.

Will you accept Mr. Laurier as a proper witness? Again, he says:

All that we ask under these resolutions is to obtain for the man who works in the field the best possible remuneration for his labor.

And then he compliments the minister of finance, Mr. Fielding, and the minister of customs, Mr. Patterson, who negotiated in secret this agreement with our Secretary of State. If the people of the United States had been informed what they were up to, in my judgment, their indignation would have thundered throughout the country until no Secretary of State would have dared make the agreement. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Sir Wilfrid Laurier thanks these two men for having obtained from the United States such an advantageous arrangement, and having obtained it without the sacrifice of any Canadian interest. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Again, Sir Wilfrid Laurier says:

I stated a moment ago that the agreement we made is simply to get better prices for the products of the Canadian farmer.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, that is the statement of the man who is responsible for the Canadian government. The man responsible in an executive capacity for our Government says: "No; Sir Wilfrid, you are wrong."

Again Mr. Laurier says, and I want your attention to this:

Then there is the cattle trade. Years ago we had a cattle trade with Great Britain. We have some yet, but it is not as large as it ought to be, because everybody knows that it has been constantly retarded by the exchange embargo put upon it some 20 years ago or so, and therefore if we are not able to sell all the cattle we can raise in Great Britain, there is a ready market in the United States.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Again, the Canadian premier says:

We are exporters not of manufactured products, but of natural products, and we are large importers of manufactured products; and we have given to the Americans a free entrance to our markets only for their natural products, as they have given us a free entrance to their market for our natural products.

Again, he says:

It is not a great effort of imagination to suppose that the Americans were far more concerned about obtaining reciprocity in manufactured products than in natural products; but our negotiators would not consent to any reciprocity in manufactured products, but insisted on limiting the agreement simply to such manufactured products as agricultural implements.

Mr. Laurier is a remarkably candid and square man. He wants this legislation for the protection and benefit of the agriculturists in Canada. I am against it, because I believe it will work grave injury to the one-third of our people engaged in agriculture and inevitably to all our people, because if the agriculturist does not prosper, if his lands are sold for taxes, if his numbers decrease, if his production falls off, if he becomes a starvation consumer for the factories in Connecticut and in Massachusetts that weave the clothing, the whole people are bound to suffer.

STEEL TRUST FAVORS THE AGREEMENT.

Now I want to refer to one or two other matters. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] represents that great district in which Birmingham is situated, where God Almighty, when he threw matter into space, placed side by side the iron ore and the limestone and the coal. It is said that the great

United States Steel Corporation—and I have no abuse for it as long as it performs its functions for the benefit of all the people—has so large an interest in the district which my friend represents that it is very desirous that this bill should pass. My information is accurate, for I have it in black and white from a man who ought to know.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to state to the gentleman from Illinois that I am not in the confidence of the United States Steel Corporation. They do own about one-third of the iron ore in my district, a very valuable property. I am satisfied the gentleman from Illinois can inform the House as to its plan of procedure better than I can. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. After all, that is gratuitous. I did not speak of the gentleman personally in connection with this matter, I spoke of the factors in his district, which is being so magnificently developed. I want to say that if he could construe what I said into a reflection on him personally, it seems to me he would have to strain the construction.

Now, I will look my friend in the eye and say that I never, directly or indirectly, had any interest in the United States Steel Corporation, nor did any relative of mine. That great corporation may or may not be violating the law. If it is, let it be prosecuted. But, as it is a great corporation, and as I have, as I think, been reliably informed that it believes this agreement ought to be ratified, I made that statement.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In what I said I intended to make no reflection on the gentleman's personality, but merely meant to imply that the gentleman, speaking from the standpoint of the Republican Party, must of necessity be very much closer to the Steel Corporation than I was, speaking from the standpoint of the Democratic Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. That is the case with all industries.

Mr. CANNON. I am proud of all the industries in this great Republic—the railroads, the factories, and the furnaces. I am proud, also, of the great development brought about by that great organization the Standard Oil Co., no member of which I have any personal knowledge of directly or indirectly. Its fleets are upon every ocean. Its production is magnificent. It reaches with its pipe lines into the districts represented by my colleague, Dr. FOSTER, and myself. Our constituents, Doctor, were exceedingly anxious to get them to construct their pipe lines, and now that they have got them, I fancy that, while some of our constituents are very anxious to damn them, they would not have them turned out. [Laughter.] The American people have worked and are working out their own salvation.

THE FREE-LIST BILLS OF 1894.

Now, then, one word more. I hold in my hand the bill reported, as I understand, this morning by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], placing on the free list agricultural implements and various other articles. Already in the Payne law, which has been so cursed and damned, any country can have free trade with us in agricultural implements pro-

vided it grants a like concession to us. You now propose to go further. You say to Great Britain, and you say to every foreign manufacturer of agricultural implements, come in without price and enjoy the markets of 90,000,000 of people without yielding anything in return. Canada levies, I believe, a tariff of from 12½ per cent to 20 per cent on agricultural implements.

This is not the first time the Democrats have passed popgun tariff bills through the House. I was here when the Wilson law was passed. I saw the virile Democratic majority run the steam roller over the minority, and agree en bloc to 600 Senate amendments without dotting an i or crossing a t. That was pretty bad. Cleveland said the bill was a measure of perfidy and dishonor, and he let the bill become a law without signing it. But it became a law all the same, and the present honored Speaker of the House [Mr. CLARK] spoke and voted for it. Then what happened? The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Springer, a Democratic Member, rose in his place and offered a popgun bill, putting iron ore on the free list. They just rushed it through by the aid of the steam roller. Then, I think, bills placing coal and several other articles on the free list were passed in the same way. The Democrats in the House said, "We will show the people that we are willing to make a free list." They thought that was fine politics. We were just entering upon the campaign in the fall of 1894, and after that election the Republican Party came back into the House with a majority of something like 120. Oh, yes; you passed the Wilson bill as you propose to pass the reciprocity bill—without amendment—and you passed popgun bills putting numerous articles on the free list, just as you propose to do now. When I was a boy I read about that wonderful bird, the ostrich, with its small head and great body, and when it wanted to hide it stuck its head in the sand. I used to wonder how that ostrich looked. I saw how it looked when you passed those bills. [Laughter.] History repeats itself.

Pass your popgun bills through, but they will not, in my judgment, serve you any better than similar bills served your ostrich brethren in 1894.

"Oh," it is said, "we must pass this bill as it is, because if it is amended Canada won't have it." Who is legislating for the United States—we or Canada? [Applause on the Republican side.] A treaty made under the auspices of Great Britain, between Canada and France, was hung up in the French Senate for months. It was said that it must not be amended or Canada would not have it; but the French amended it, and provided that fattened cattle coming into France on the hoof should not come in under the minimum tariff, but should pay the maximum tax. They amended it from the standpoint of the interest of the people of France.

The treaty went back to Canada. The negotiations were ended if Canada did not accept the amendment. Canada did accept the amendment. Canada has not yet acted upon this measure. Would it not be well enough to let Canada speak for herself? Gentlemen, you may pass this bill, and if it is enacted into law and disaster comes on account of it, the American sovereign, as you will find out, has a keen eye and a long recollection. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It has been stated that the adoption of the reciprocity agreement will increase our trade with Canada. On evidence that

would be strong enough to impel me to act upon matters of great importance to myself or my country, I say that is not its object at all. Have you noticed the figures of our imports into Canada?

CAN WE IMPROVE OUR TRADE WITH CANADA?

To those who urge that the ratification of the proposed reciprocity agreement will expand our trade with Canada and widen the market in that country for American production, let me quote from the Canada Yearbook for 1909 the figures of imports.

In 1909 the total imports into Canada were \$309,756,608. Of this amount, \$192,661,360 came from the United States; \$86,257,557 from the British Empire, including Newfoundland; and \$30,837,691 from all other foreign countries. In other words, the United States sent into Canada in the year 1909 \$75,566,112 more in products than all the rest of the world, including Great Britain and the British possessions.

As showing the growth of the trade of the United States with Canada, the percentages furnished by the Canada Yearbook are even more illuminating, showing, as they do, that the United States has gradually, year by year, increased its trade with Canada until in the year 1909 59 per cent of the total imports into Canada came from the United States.

In 1868, when the Dominion Government was organized, the percentage of imports from Great Britain into Canada subject to duty was 64.78 of the total imports subject to duty; and the percentage of imports which came in free was 39.82 of the total imports which came in free. In the same year the percentage of imports from Great Britain and the British possessions dutiable and free to the total imports dutiable and free was 56.06.

The percentage of imports from the United States to Canada for the same year subject to duty was 22.93 of the total imports subject to duty, and the percentage of imports from the United States which came in free was 53.96 of the total imports which were admitted into Canada without payment of duty. The percentage of all imports from the United States dutiable and free to the total imports dutiable and free was 33.77.

Since the year 1868 the proportion of imports from Great Britain to Canada to imports from the United States has steadily decreased until in 1909 Great Britain sent to Canada only 29.84 per cent of the total dutiable imports admitted to Canada, 16.31 per cent of the total imports admitted into Canada free of duty, and 24.52 per cent of the total imports of Canada.

The percentages of the United States, on the other hand, had increased, until in 1909 we sent to Canada 51.76 per cent of her total dutiable imports, 70.20 per cent of her total free imports, and 59 per cent of her total importation, dutiable and free.

The average for the 42-year period from 1868 to 1909 for the respective countries of Great Britain and the United States is as follows:

<i>Imported from Great Britain.</i>	Per cent.
Dutiable to total dutiable-----	41.24
Free to total free-----	22.39
Dutiable and free to all imports-----	34.49

<i>Imported from the United States.</i>	Per cent.
Dutiable to total dutiable-----	43.15
Free to total free-----	65.75
Dutiable and free to all imports-----	51.24

It is interesting and instructive to note the average ad valorem rate of duty paid by American imports into Canada in comparison with the average on imports into Canada from Great Britain and other countries. In spite of the Canadian preferential tariff in favor of Great Britain, the figures show that the lowest average ad valorem rate is paid by imports from the United States. I quote the following figures taken from the Canada Yearbook, 1909 (p. 225) :

	Per cent.
Average ad valorem rate on dutiable imports into Canada from Great Britain, 1909	25.755
Average ad valorem rate on dutiable imports into Canada from the United States, 1909	24.868
Average ad valorem on all imports into Canada from Great Britain, 1909	19.028
Average ad valorem on all imports into Canada from the United States, 1909	13.247
Average ad valorem on dutiable imports into Canada from all countries, 1909	27.315
Average ad valorem on all imports into Canada from all countries, 1909	16.586

When Canada wanted to make a reciprocity treaty with the United States in Harrison's administration they asked permission that they might come to Washington and treat. The pending agreement was initiated upon our invitation, not upon theirs, and it is the first instance of the kind in the history of the country.

FREE PRINT PAPER THE ISSUE.

What are we to gain by such an agreement? We have the lion's share of trade with Canada, and at a less ad valorem than any other country on earth. Why did this invitation go? What was there that caused this agreement to be initiated without the Secretary of State taking the American people into his confidence? Now, I am going to present the evidence to you, you being the jury. There has been a good deal of talk, running over several years, about the price of print paper. I have not been under the tongue of good report with the publishers of our metropolitan newspapers and magazines. I only refer to it to illustrate the situation. I have no feeling about the matter. It is behind us. The publishers can not now change it, nor can I.

The Committee on Ways and Means in the Sixtieth Congress was headed by Mr. PAYNE, Mr. McCALL, Mr. DALZELL, and others being members. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS introduced his free print-paper bill, and it went to that committee. As I am informed, the committee by a unanimous vote, including the honorable gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], then and now a member of that committee, postponed the bill for that session of Congress, and did not even hold hearings on it. I was Speaker. They unloaded on me. [Laughter and applause.] The minority in the House had inaugurated a filibuster that lasted to the end of the session. It was ably lead by Mr. WILLIAMS, now a Senator from Mississippi. We had a stormy time. Newspaper publishers, through their representatives, one of whom I will name, Mr. Herman Ridder, came to me, demanding that I should do something which had never been done, so far as I know, in the history of the Republic—that I should recognize some Member, JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS or some one else, on a Monday—suspension day—and move to dis-

charge the Committee on Ways and Means from further consideration of that bill and pass it.

I said that I could not do that; that it would not be just to my party. I said, "This is no time, on the eve of a presidential election, to take such action, and by doing so, if I had any regard for my personal welfare, I would subject myself to legitimate criticism, lose the respect of the minority, receive the condemnation of the majority, and the disapproval of the country." [Applause.]

There was some nasty talk, to which I will not refer, and it is not necessary to do so; but I have been hammered from that time to this, though I believe they have let up on me now, inasmuch as I am no longer the Speaker, and I am enjoying a little season of rest. It is all right. I am 75 years old, and, whatever they do, when I appear at the gate of either of the places where men go hereafter [laughter], whether I go where they wear asbestos halos or those of muslin, I will walk with my head erect and say, "I retain my own self-respect." [Loud applause.]

I am not going far into the matter here. I am going to run over the personal part of it as rapidly as possible. Many things happened about that time, and threats were made that if the Republican Party did not promptly put print paper upon the free list that great and good man who headed the Publishers' Association, Mr. Herman Ridder, would support Mr. Bryan for the Presidency and contribute \$100,000 to his election.

We did not pass that bill, and when the time came Mr. Ridder was made treasurer of the Democratic national committee, and I guess he gave you boys on the Democratic side \$50,000, did he not? [Laughter.] The newspapers say so, and I have never seen it denied. So much for that.

COST OF PRODUCTION HERE AND IN CANADA.

I recollect very well that under the hot attack upon myself personally, and upon the party of which I was a member, I looked about for some means of defense, and I introduced a resolution creating a special committee to investigate the condition as to print paper. When the resolution was agreed to, I appointed that committee, and my honorable colleague [Mr. MANN] was made chairman. The House will recall the high personnel of that committee, and will agree that it worked industriously. But from one end of the country to the other I was criticized for that action by resolutions passed by the Publishers' Association and by denunciations in the newspapers. The committee made an honest investigation, and in the fullness of time they submitted a report. They found that there was a difference of \$2 a ton between the cost of production in Canada and the cost of production in the United States. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], I recall, stated, if not in the report, on the floor of the House, that that was as near as they could get it to the actual difference. It was a unanimous report, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] and the other Democrat on the committee concurring.

This House in the consideration of the Payne tariff bill accepted the recommendation of the Mann special committee and fixed the duty on print paper at \$2. The bill went to the Senate, where there is no previous question. The Mann report

was not accepted by that body, and they fixed the duty at \$4 a ton. In the compromise effected between the Senate and the House—and all legislation is a compromise—the rate was made \$3.75 a ton, a reduction from \$6, the rate under the Dingley law.

In this connection, allow me to call the attention of the House to the difference between the Tariff Board and the Mann special committee on this matter. The Mann committee reported that \$2 would represent the difference, whereas the Tariff Board said that \$4.14 represented the difference. (S. Doc. 849, 61st Cong., 3d sess.) In this bill you reject both reports and propose to let it in free.

I hold no power of attorney to defend the paper industry. I have not a constituent, so far as I know, who has an interest in it. If it be true that the difference in the cost of production of this material in Canada, or anywhere else on earth, and the United States is \$2 a ton or \$4 a ton, then that difference ought to measure the tariff rate. I say that because I am a protectionist. Beyond that I have no interest.

The New York World claims that there is \$798,000,000 capital invested in the printing trades, and admits that the product last year was valued at \$857,000,000. Is there any other industry in this country whose annual product is valued at more than its entire capital?

By the industrial census of 1905 there were \$385,000,000 capital invested in these trades, including books, newspapers, periodicals, etc., and the annual product was \$496,000,000. Three-fifths of the capital and product was credited to the newspapers and periodicals, as follows:

Capital	-----	\$239, 518, 524
Salaries	-----	47, 128, 711
Wages	-----	59, 830, 768
Incidental expenses	-----	67, 638, 099
Materials	-----	70, 358, 000
Product	-----	309, 327, 606

The combined cost of production, including salaries, wages, materials, incidental expenses, amounted to \$244,955,578. Subtracting this from the value of the product, \$309,327,606, leaves \$64,372,028, which is a trifle less than 27 per cent of the capital.

Patent medicines and women's clothing were the only other industries that equaled this percentage of profit on investment in that census.

By the census of 1905 it was also shown that nearly 60 per cent of the income of newspapers and periodicals, including country weeklies, came from advertising and little more than 40 per cent from subscriptions and sales.

It is claimed by the New York World that the product of the printing trade is now valued at \$857,000,000, or nearly double what it was five years ago, and it is admitted that the income from advertising yields a greater ratio of the whole income than it did in 1905.

ADVERTISING AND THE HIGH COST OF LIVING.

The advertising bill of this country is placed at more than \$500,000,000 a year. This is from the printing trade alone. Add to this the cost of electric and mechanical advertising, and it is estimated that we are spending between \$700,000,000 and

\$800,000,000 a year for advertising—to induce the people to purchase.

So, my Democratic friends, advertising is one of the items in the high cost of living.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. And it is on the free list. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Yes; absolutely on the free list.

The total value of all farm property in 1900 was given at a little more than \$20,000,000,000, and it is now estimated at more than \$30,000,000,000, while the total value of all produce from the farms of the United States last year is given by the Secretary of Agriculture at a little less than \$9,000,000,000.

According to the figures given in the President's message, there was less than \$6,000,000 worth of wood pulp and print paper imported from Canada last year, and we are asked to open the doors and jeopardize the farmers' market for nearly \$9,000,000,000 worth of produce to enable the publishers to get less than \$6,000,000 worth of paper and pulp at a less cost than they have had to pay, when they are making 27 per cent on their invested capital.

This wood pulp and print paper is the one item in the agreement on which there is no reciprocity. Mr. Fielding, in his letter to Secretary Knox, made this perfectly clear. He said:

In the meantime the present duties on pulp and paper imported from the United States into Canada will remain.

The Canadian duty on print paper is 15 per cent.

The six cities of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Boston, and Baltimore have one-half of the whole publishing business of the United States, and it is easy to account for the enthusiastic demands for the ratification of this agreement by the publishers of those great centers of population whether the dwellers in those cities are equally clamorous or not.

The proposed reciprocity agreement should be labeled "the publishers' pact," whereby agricultural products are traded off for the publishers' profits.

I have inquired to some extent as to the capital and profits of some of the great newspapers and magazines. I recollect I made inquiry about one—the only one, perhaps, that ever perpetrated a criminal libel upon me in all my public or private life. The one to which I refer was committed by a man named Higgins, who published *Success*. I had a lawyer friend who agonized with me to bring a criminal action and civil action against him for libel. So I caused an inquiry to be made, and the information came back that the concern and some of its stockholders were so insolvent that nothing would be found on execution to satisfy a judgment against them. [Laughter.]

Now, I do not hate the newspapers. I know many of their publishers, editors, and correspondents. I have the highest respect for them. The metropolitan newspapers and magazines have access to the people. In my last campaign I covered my district by automobile, taking my constituency into my confidence. They knew, after the years I had represented them and lived with them, that I would tell the truth. When I could not get the truth into the metropolitan newspapers, the country newspapers came to my rescue. God bless the country newspapers. [Applause.] They are a part of us. When we are married and given in marriage they tell the good news. They

go to our weddings and our funerals. They rejoice with us when we rejoice and mourn with us when we mourn. [Applause.] One reason why I am against the parcels post is because it is in the interest of strangers. We know the local merchant and the commercial traveler. They belong to our churches and to our clubs. They help make our civilization; they are acquainted with our farmers and our farmers are acquainted with them; but we do not know the mail-order houses.

I do not know the men who own the enormous metropolitan papers. They have heard of me, but they do not seem to care much about me. [Laughter.] I am not complaining. I am not seeking justification. If they do not let me alone, I will not quit public life, if I get my way about it, until my constituency asks me to retire. [Applause on the Republican side.]

WHY THE PUBLISHERS WANT RECIPROCITY.

I have referred to Herman Ridder. A friend of mine who publishes a country newspaper sent me this:

AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS' ASSOCIATION,
WORLD BUILDING,
New York, March 15, 1911.

DEAR SIR: May I invite your attention to the point that promptness in ratifying the reciprocity agreement of the United States with Canada is of the utmost importance to newspapers?

There is danger in amendments, or changes, or delay.

[Laughter.]

The two Governments had a tacit understanding that the arrangement would go through as framed. The difficulties attending ratification on the Canadian side may be increased greatly if there is hesitation or an attempt on our part to make a new trade.

Will you kindly urge, through your publication and by letters to your Representative and Senators, that the agreement as made by the State Department be passed speedily by Congress and without amendment?

Yours, faithfully,

HERMAN RIDDER,
President American Newspaper Publishers' Association.

[Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, I have another:

[Established 1844.]

CHICAGO DAILY JOURNAL,
Chicago, Ill., November 18, 1910.

This is dated before the making of the reciprocity agreement—

MY DEAR SIR:—

I want the Democratic Members to listen to this and see if they will not recognize this delightful letter. Stand up now and bear testimony—

I want you all to get up and sing "Renew my courage, Lord," and say whether you got this letter. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

MY DEAR SIR: The independent press—

This is one of the independent fellows. [Laughter.]—

The independent press of the country, and a large part of the Republican press, supported Democratic candidates this year because Republican Senators and Representatives did not keep their word in regard to removing the tariff on paper.

In my opinion the way to insure the continued support of those publishers through the campaign of 1912 is to put all print paper, pulp, and all material entering into the manufacture of paper on the free list at the earliest possible moment, and to announce now that that will be the policy of Democrats in Congress.

Yours, truly,
90983—9855

JOHN C. EASTMAN.

Is there anybody on the other side of the House who did not get one of these letters? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] If so, let him arise and say so. No one arises.

It does not make much difference to me what somebody said in the past or what somebody did in the past so long as they do not violate the law. What they said and did may sometimes be useful as an example and admonition, but it does not shed much light on the present or on the future. Yet there have been so many efforts to drag in the name of William McKinley, by whose side I sat for 16 years when he was an honored Member of this House, that I want to clear the matter up a little bit. Somebody has got to defend the dead.

M'KINLEY'S RECIPROCITY POLICY.

McKinley held to the Republican theory of reciprocity in non-competing products. In his opening speech on the McKinley bill in the House of Representatives, May 7, 1890, speaking of reciprocity, he said:

We have been beaten in every instance. From 1854 to 1866—12 years of reciprocity with Canada—we bought of them twice as much as they bought of us. Ninety-five per cent of their products came into the United States free of duty, while only 42 per cent of ours went into Canada free of duty. Mr. Chairman, what these other countries want is a free and open market with the United States. What we want, if we ever have reciprocity, must be reciprocity with equality, reciprocity that shall be fair, reciprocity that shall be just, reciprocity that shall give us our share in the trade or arrangement that we make with the other nations of the world.

It will be seen, Mr. Chairman, that wherever we have tried reciprocity or low duties we have always been the loser.

President McKinley did not advance upon any new ground in 1901. He said at Buffalo substantially what he had said in his first inaugural address March 4, 1897. Here is the reciprocity paragraph from his inaugural address, and I challenge anyone to find any other or different policy set forth in his Buffalo speech:

In the revision of the tariff especial attention should be given to the reenactment and extension of the reciprocity principle of the law of 1890, under which so great a stimulus was given to our foreign trade in new and advantageous markets for our surplus agricultural and manufactured products. The brief trial given this legislation amply justifies a further experiment and additional discretionary power in the making of commercial treaties, the end in view always to be the opening of new markets for the products of our country by granting concessions to the products of other lands that we need and can not produce ourselves and which do not involve any loss of labor to our own people, but tend to increase their employment.

That is just what President McKinley said in the beginning of his administration when he gave notice that he would call the Congress to meet in extraordinary session on March 15, 1897, to revise the tariff on protection lines, and it is substantially what he said in his last public utterance at Buffalo in September, 1901.

What did McKinley say at Buffalo? Here it is:

By sensible trade arrangements, which will not interrupt our home production, we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus. * * * We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industry and labor. * * * What we produce beyond our domestic consumption must have a vent abroad. The excess must be relieved through a foreign outlet, and we should sell everywhere we can and buy wherever the buying will enlarge our sales and production, and thereby make a greater demand for home labor.

McKinley's idea of reciprocity was to provide an outlet for our surplus production; the pending reciprocity measure is an attempt to cheapen our consumption.

McKinley sought to increase our exports; this proposes to increase our imports. The two schemes are radically different.

Oftentimes when McKinley's Buffalo speech is quoted the words "without harm to our industry and labor" are omitted. I indorse every word of that speech. It is in harmony with his official life and his action as a legislator. I have always been for that policy announced by McKinley and always expect to be for it.

I recollect that a great candidate for office in 1904 read that extract; but he left out the words "without harm to our industry and labor," so that it would read, "We should take from our customers such of our products as we could use." I had to meet that quotation frequently, and I could always meet it in a sentence. Gentlemen will recall the old story about the infidel and the preacher. The infidel said that he could prove by the preacher's own Bible that there was no God. "Show me," said the preacher. The infidel turned over and found one of the chapters which David is supposed to have written, and he said, "There it is." It read, "There is no God." But the parson had read his Bible. He said, "You scoundrel, take your thumb off and read it all." And when he did so, it read, "The fool saith in his heart there is no God." [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I had no idea I should talk so long. I am a Republican and a protectionist. I indorse the Republican policy announced in the Republican platform of 1908. I believe in it, and I will support it; but I beg gentlemen to recollect that there is nothing perfect that comes from the hand of man, and there never will be enacted a tariff bill satisfactory in every particular to any man. Perfection comes from God alone, who has all wisdom and all power.

I voted for the Payne-Aldrich bill. I agree with the President in what he said at Winona, that it is the best protective-tariff bill ever passed. I still believe that. If I had supreme power, I would wipe out some things in it. I could find duties here and there which might be lowered, and I want to tell the truth and say that I could find here and there an article on the dutiable list with a duty that is not protective, or an article on the free list which, if placed on the protective list, would have founded great industries.

HYSTERIA HALTS PRODUCTION.

Hysteria has been promoted by the great publishers. They can do a great deal in destroying parties and wiping out individuals, but they can not do as much as they could have done two years or four years ago. [Applause.] When this proposed agreement is vitalized by legislation, when you hold the country up with the threat of tariff revision, to get rid of the Payne law, which the President said—and I think, substantially, all on this side agree with him—was the best protective tariff bill ever passed, though not perfect, you make men fearful. The farmer buys 5 per cent or 10 per cent less; the man with a fixed income buys a little less; and the laborer on the railway or elsewhere buys a little less; and when you reduce by 5 per cent the capacity of our 92,000,000 people to consume, you close factories, you cut down wages, you beget strikes.

You ought to recollect that, my Democratic friends. Some of you were living in 1894, and some of you were here; but there are many of you who have come in since who will have to learn by kindergarten instruction.

Now, I want to say to men on this side of the House that I am somewhat full of combativeness. Sometimes I seem to have temper when I have none, and sometimes I have temper when I think I am under unjust charge; but when matters are behind me, I say again, as I have said on a former occasion, there is nothing in animate nature that I would harm or punish. I never expect to agree with all of you, and most of you, perhaps, will not agree with opinions I may hold; but we must cooperate; we must stand together or hang separately. [Laughter.] We are in the minority. We are not responsible for legislation. The Democrats are responsible. Our office is criticism, and I think we are perfectly able to perform the duties of that office. [Laughter.]

I want to say to my New England friends, to my Missouri friends, to my Illinois friends, and to all men who share the Republican faith, that if the Republican Party is to live, it can live only by being true to and supporting the policy of protection, under which the men who live in the sweat of their faces, bearing the burdens of the most expensive civilization on earth, receive \$2, as compared with \$1 received by labor in other countries of the world; by equalizing production in our own country and keeping our own markets.

Gentlemen from Massachusetts, gentlemen from the Keystone State, the citadel of protection, the great State that through evil and good report has always kept the Republican faith, may hug to their breasts the delusion, on account of all that has been said as to the high cost of living, that they want you to vote for this measure; but, Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, without regard to what others may think, God helping me, I will keep the Republican faith; and after the majority, substantially in solid phalanx, vitalizes this outrageous legislation, I would sooner take my chances in 1912 as an adherent of Republican doctrine.

To you gentlemen from Massachusetts I will say that I love Massachusetts. She has done more, perhaps, than any Commonwealth in the Union in shaping the sentiment and promoting the civilization of the people of the great Republic. Did you vote for Foss in the last election? Is he to represent the permanent public sentiment in Massachusetts? When the penalty is paid, as it will be paid between this and the year 1912, and consumption and production are restricted and decrease, are you still going to support him? Is he your leader? This bill might well be labeled, "A bill by the grace—or punishment—of God, the aid of the Secretary of State, and Foss, of Massachusetts, and the almost solid vote of Democratic Members." Choose ye! [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman takes his seat I will ask him if he will permit a question?

LIVERPOOL DOES NOT FIX THE PRICE.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly; if it is apt.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I have been very greatly interested and entertained by the remarkably able speech of the

distinguished gentleman from Illinois. Toward the close of it he said he was a protectionist and a Republican. I, too, am a protectionist and a Republican, and I wish to ask him this question, and to say before asking the question this, that I never as a Republican claimed that the price of wheat in the United States was not fixed in Liverpool. The gentleman entered into a very astute and very earnest argument to show that the price of wheat in the United States was not fixed in Liverpool. Does the gentleman entertain that view as a Republican?

Mr. CANNON. The price of wheat, I am satisfied, is fixed where the major part of the product is sold. [Applause.] Five-sixths of the wheat produced in the United States is sold to our own people in the United States. I will further answer the gentleman's question by asking another: Will the gentleman have the kindness to make things as plain by explaining why wheat of the same quality averages from 12 to 15 cents more in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg?

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him one other question? I recalled while the gentleman was speaking, that I heard the gentleman from Illinois say that the price of American wheat was fixed in Liverpool. I remembered that because it was my first term in Congress, and I found the RECORD—

Mr. CANNON. On what occasion? What was the bill?

Mr. COOPER. It is page 994 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Fifty-third Congress, second session.

Mr. CANNON. Read.

Mr. COOPER (reading)—

Mr. SIMPSON—

Speaking to Mr. CANNON.

Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the gentleman not admit that we are now competing in Europe with the different countries of the Old World for the sale of our wheat?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly; with Roumania, Russia, and India.

Mr. SIMPSON. Then the gentleman will admit that the price we receive there fixes the price of our article not only in the United States but in the foreign markets?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly; all prices are regulated by the prevailing market, wherever it is.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman then went on to say—I will be candid with the gentleman—that he thought we should protect by a tariff our market here so that we could develop a market and consume all we produce and not have any surplus, but he unequivocally stated, and I have always carried the impression and never heard it doubted, that the surplus in competition with the world fixed the price. If we could get more at home we would not sell the surplus over there.

Mr. CANNON. I fancy that I might, on reading all that was said, possibly have nothing to apologize for in a speech made, I take it, in running debate in 1894. I have no pride in what I have said in former years. Let me say to the gentleman, I can turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the first Congress in which I served, the Forty-third Congress, and I can show him where I, too, believed that commerce knew no boundaries, and that there should be universal free trade. I had

not the benefit of a college education. I had practiced law for a living until I came down here at the age of 36. It did not take me long by study and observation to become a Republican in fact as well as in name, and, being converted to the true faith, I suppose I will die in it. I have no pride in what I have said heretofore touching the matter. The gentleman can find in an examination of—

Mr. DALZELL. There is no contradiction.

Mr. CANNON. I do not care to discuss what I said although it seems to me what I said in 1894 does not conflict with what I have said to-day. The gentleman can go back, if he desires and has the interest, and hunt up my record, and he will find that in 1876, in Illinois, we made a contest for the free coinage of silver. There were only two points of difference in value between 16 of silver to 1 of gold, silver then being worth 98 cents an ounce. The issue was not metallic money, but fiat money—"be thou a dollar." I voted to put out great quantities of "sound money." It was not as sound, as subsequently developed, but it had real value, and I recollect putting my contestant out of business when I said to him, "If a fiat of the law can make a dollar, he is an infernally mean man who will not let the Government issue millions of dollars and make us rich, inasmuch as it costs nothing."

Mr. MADDEN. Will my colleague yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] yield to his colleague [Mr. MADDEN]?

Mr. CANNON. I do.

Mr. MADDEN. Just one word.

Mr. CANNON. All right.

Mr. MADDEN. As a matter of fact, what my colleague said in his speech concerning 1894 corroborates exactly what he said to-day, namely, that the price was fixed in the market where the bulk of the product was sold. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CANNON. I care little about what I said then; I am standing by my vote on this measure. [Applause.]



UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 057569813